

## **REMARKS**

In response to the Office Action mailed July 2, 2007, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. Claims 1-7 were previously pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 2, 6 and 7 have been amended. New claims 8-14 have been added. As a result, claims 1-14 are pending for examination with claims 1, 7 and 8 being independent. No new matter has been added.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112**

The Office Action rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Office Action states that claims 7 uses the phrase “capable of.” Applicant notes that this phrase is found only in claim 6, which has been amended to address the Examiner’s concerns.<sup>1</sup>

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102**

The Office Action rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Record et al., U.S. Patent No. US 5,237,684 (hereinafter, “Record”). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant has amended claims 1, 2, 6 and 7 to correct minor informalities.

#### **A. Independent Claim 1**

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

A method for transmitting digital messages through output terminals of a monitoring circuit integrated with a microprocessor, said messages being representative of determined events occurring on execution of instructions by the microprocessor, comprising:

after or before transmission of at least one specific digital message associated with a specific event, transmitting a correlation message comprising an identifier of said specific digital message and a counter of a number of instructions executed by the microprocessor between an instruction associated with the transmission of said specific message and an instruction associated with transmission of a selected previous digital message.

---

<sup>1</sup> Applicant assumes that, in the Office Action, claim 6 has been inadvertently referred to as claim 7.

On page 3, the Office Action states that Record teaches limitations of claim 1 in Col. 1, lines 41-44, 45-55 and in Col. 5, lines 21-68.

Record is directed to a computer operating system that manages different types of events. (Record, Abstract). In the above portions of Record cited in the Office Action, Record describes, inter alia, that [i]f an application program or other function within the operating system 11 is interested in receiving notification of an event and the event data, if any, the application program or other operating system function defines an event monitor. (Record, Col. 4, lines 24-28). The event monitor definition specifies the number or "count" of distinct event signals, i.e. *the number of the specified events* which must have occurred at least once, which are required to "satisfy" the event monitor. (Record, Col. 4, lines 44-48). Therefore, Record describes the count of the number of the specified events which must have occurred at least once. In contrast, claim 1 recites a counter of *a number of instructions* executed by the microprocessor *between* an instruction associated with the transmission of said specific message and an instruction associated with transmission of a selected previous digital message. Furthermore, Record does not discuss transmitting a correlation message comprising an identifier of said specific digital message.

In view of the above, Record does not teach or suggest "a method for transmitting digital messages through output terminals of a monitoring circuit integrated with a microprocessor, said messages being representative of determined events occurring on execution of instructions by the microprocessor, comprising: after or before transmission of at least one specific digital message associated with a specific event, transmitting a correlation message comprising an identifier of said specific digital message and a counter of a number of instructions executed by the microprocessor between an instruction associated with the transmission of said specific message and an instruction associated with transmission of a selected previous digital message," as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Record and is in condition for allowance.

Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-6 is respectfully requested.

B. Independent Claim 7

Claim 7, as amended, recites:

A device for transmitting digital messages through output terminals of a monitoring circuit integrated with a microprocessor, said digital messages being representative of determined events occurring on execution of instructions by the microprocessor, comprising:

means for detecting whether a digital message to be transmitted by the monitoring circuit is of a specific type; and

means for transmitting, after or before transmission of a digital message of said specific type, a correlation message, said correlation message comprising an identifier of said specific digital message and a counter of a number of instructions executed by the microprocessor between an instruction associated with the transmission of the specific digital message and an instruction associated with transmission of a selected previous digital message.

As discussed above, Record does not teach or suggest “means for transmitting, after or before transmission of a digital message of said specific type, a correlation message, said correlation message comprising an identifier of said specific digital message and a counter of a number of instructions executed by the microprocessor between an instruction associated with the transmission of the specific digital message and an instruction associated with transmission of a selected previous digital message,” as recited in claim 7.

Accordingly, claim 7 patentably distinguishes over Record and is in condition for allowance.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 7 is respectfully requested.

New Claims

New claim 8 recites:

A system comprising:

a microprocessor for transmitting digital messages representative of events occurring on execution of instructions by the microprocessor; and

means for transmitting, after or before transmission of at least one digital message associated with an event, a correlation message comprising at least an identifier of the digital message and a counter comprising a number of instructions executed by the microprocessor between an instruction associated with the transmission of the digital message and an instruction associated with transmission of a previous digital message.

As discussed above, Record does not teach or suggest “means for transmitting, after or before transmission of at least one digital message associated with an event, a correlation message comprising at least an identifier of the digital message and a counter comprising a number of instructions executed by the microprocessor between an instruction associated with the transmission of the digital message and an instruction associated with transmission of a previous digital message,” as recited in claim 8.

Accordingly, claim 8 patentably distinguishes over Record and is in condition for allowance.

Claims 9-14 depend from claim 8 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

**CONCLUSION**

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if this communication does not place the case in condition for allowance.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825.

Dated: November 2, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By: /James H. Morris/  
James H. Morris, Reg. No. 34,681  
Wolf, Greenfield & Sacks, P.C.  
600 Atlantic Avenue  
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206  
Telephone: (617) 646-8000